



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,375	01/30/2006	Gerhard Wolf	284682US-0-PCT	2107
22850	7590	07/28/2009	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			HAMMER, KATIE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/28/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/566,375	WOLF ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KATIE HAMMER	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 5-8 and 11-26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 5,6,8,12-14,16,18,21,22 and 24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 7,13,15,17,19,20,23,25 and 26 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/24/2006.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Claims 5-8 and 12-26 are pending in the application.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 5-8 and addition of claims 12-26 in the reply filed on May 1, 2009 is acknowledged. Claims 1-4 and 11 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on May 1, 2009.

The Examiner maintains the restriction requirement because the process for preparing the polymer and its use in leather treatments requires different search strategies than the claims to the epichlorohydrinamine polymer product itself.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinoshita et al. (JP-11277887, accessed in English by machine translation, all references made to the translated document).

As to claims 5-6, Kinoshita et al. disclose a cationic resin which has the structure expressed by the general formula [1] produced by reaction of an amine compound such as ethylenediamine, diethylenetriamine, triethylenetetramine, tetraethylenepentamine, dipropylenetriamine, and N,N'-dimethylethylenediamine with epihalohydrin (see para. 0004 and 0005). Kinoshita et al. teaches that the cationic compound can be made by combining two or more sorts (see para. 0006). Epichlorohydrin can be used as the epihalohydrin in the invention (see para. 0007).

Any difference imparted by the product by process limitations would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because where the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to establish that their product is patentably distinct, not the examiner to show the same process of making, see *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324.

As to claim 8, Kinoshita teaches that there is no restriction in particular of a molecular weight of cationic resin for use in the invention (see para. 0008). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have synthesized the epichlorohydrinamine polymer of the instantly claimed molecular weight.

As to claims 12, 14, 18, 21-22, Kinoshita teaches the instantly claimed epichlorohydrinamine polymer as described above in product by process claims, and therefore the burden is shifted to the Applicant to show any product differences in product by process claims. See MPEP 2113.

As to claim 16, Kinoshita et al. teaches that there is no restriction in particular in epihalohydrin to be used for this invention, and that epichlorohydrin can be used (see para. 0007). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected an alpha-epichlorohydrin for use in the instantly claimed polymer.

As to claim 24, Kinoshita et al. teaches that formic acid can be used in the synthesis of the cationic resin (see para. 0007).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 13, 15, 17, 19-20, 23, and 25-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record does not teach or disclose the limitations of these instant claims, specifically wherein the two different amines are dimethylaminopropylamine and benzylamine, and the ratio of the amines to the epichlorohydrin.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KATIE HAMMER whose telephone number is (571)270-7342. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 10:00am EST to 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lorna M Douyon/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/KLH/